

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ZUNUM AERO, INC.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 THE BOEING COMPANY, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C21-0896JLR

ORDER

15 Before the court are (1) Defendants The Boeing Company (“Boeing”) and Boeing  
16 HorizonX Ventures, LLC’s (“HorizonX”) (collectively, “Boeing”) motion to seal its  
17 motion to compel discovery and certain exhibits filed in support of its motion (BMTS  
18 (Dkt. # 84)) and (2) Plaintiff Zunum Aero, Inc.’s (“Zunum”) motion to seal its opposition  
19 to Boeing’s motion to compel and certain exhibits filed in support of its opposition  
20 (ZMTS (Dkt. # 95)). The parties do not oppose each other’s motions to seal. (BMTS  
21 Resp. (Dkt. # 93); ZMTS Resp. (Dkt. # 108).) The court has considered the parties’

22 //

1 submissions, the balance of the record, and the applicable law. Being fully advised,<sup>1</sup> the  
 2 court GRANTS Zunum's motion to seal and GRANTS Boeing's motion to seal.

3 During the course of briefing Boeing's motion to compel discovery, the parties  
 4 filed a series of documents under provisional seal and, in many cases, also filed redacted  
 5 versions of those documents on the court's docket (*see generally* Dkt.).<sup>2</sup> In conjunction  
 6 with the filing of various documents under provisional seal, the parties filed the above  
 7 listed motions seeking the court's authorization to place the documents or portions of  
 8 documents at issue under seal.

9 The court has reviewed the parties' motions to seal as well as the documents or  
 10 portions of documents the parties have placed under seal. Based on that review, the court  
 11 concludes that the parties have met the standard for placing documents under seal set  
 12 forth in the applicable case law and this court's Local Rule 5(g). *See Kamakana v. City*  
 13 *& Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006); Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR  
 14 5(g). Accordingly, the court GRANTS Zunum's motion to seal (Dkt. # 95), GRANTS  
 15

---

16  
 17 <sup>1</sup> No one has requested oral argument (*see* ZMTS; ZMTS Resp.; BMTS; BMTS Resp.),  
 18 and the court has determined that oral argument would not be helpful to its disposition of the  
 motions, *see* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(4).

19 <sup>2</sup> For example, Zunum filed both a sealed and redacted version of its opposition to  
 Boeing's motion to compel (MTC Resp. (Dkt. # 100 (sealed)) (Dkt. # 98 (redacted))), and  
 Boeing filed both a sealed and redacted version of its motion to compel (MTC (Dkt. # 88  
 20 (sealed)) (Dkt. # 86 (redacted))). Additionally, both parties filed various exhibits in support of  
 their submissions under seal. (*See, e.g.*, Ex. 2 to Koenig Decl. (Dkt. # 89 (sealed)); Ex. 3 to  
 21 Koenig Decl. (Dkt. # 90 (sealed)); Ex. 5 to Koenig Decl. (Dkt. # 91 (sealed)); Ex. 2 to Danner  
 Decl. (Dkt. # 101 (sealed)); Ex. 3 to Danner Decl. (Dkt. # 102 (sealed)); Ex. 4 to Danner Decl.  
 22 (Dkt. # 103 (sealed)); Ex. 5 to Danner Decl. (Dkt. # 104 (sealed)); Ex. 6 to Danner Decl. (Dkt.  
 # 105 (sealed)).)

1 Boeing's motion to seal (Dkt. # 84), and DIRECTS the clerk to maintain the seal on all  
2 documents that are provisionally under seal on the court's docket as of this date.

3 Dated this 5th day of December, 2022.

4  
5 

6 JAMES L. ROBART  
7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22